

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Koike et al. (US 2002/0192003 A1) in view of Wen (US 6091433 A).

#### **Koike et al. disclose the following claim limitations:**

As per claim 1: a digital photofinishing system comprising a digital processor (figure 1, element 42), a printer (figure 1, element 46) and means for feeding plain paper to the printer from a roll of the paper (figure 2, elements 62 and 63), the digital processor being arranged to receive digitised data that is representative of a photographic image and to process the data in a manner to generate a printer drive signal that is representative of the photographic image [0037], [0109] – [0110], the printer being coupled to the digital processor (figure 1, elements 42, 44, and 46) and arranged to process the drive signal and effect page-width printing (figure 2, element 46 is a pagewidth printhead) of the photographic image on the non-coated paper as it is fed directly to the printer from the roll (figure 2, element 62), and the printer incorporating at least one print head assembly that is arranged to provide for printing on the non-coated paper (ink absorbing paper) [0050].

As per claim 9: the digitised data is input to the digital processor as a standardised image compression signal and processed as JPEG files [0042] – [0044].

**Koike et al. do not disclose the following claim limitations:**

As per claim 1: the digital processor is arranged to receive digitized data from an input source selected from a computer disk, digital camera, digital camera memory card, a digital file and an internet connection, or non-coated paper.

**Wen the following claim limitations:**

As per claim 1: a digital processor (figure 5, element 305), a printer (figure 1, element 50), the digital processor being arranged to receive digitized data that is representative of a photographic image and to process data in a manner to generate a printer drive signal that is representative of the photographic paper the digital processor is arranged to receive digitized data from an input source selected from a computer disk, digital camera, digital camera memory card, a digital file and an internet connection image (column 4, lines 4-30 and 58-67) so as to print on non-coated paper (column 6, lines 1-12 – no coating on paper so that it is absorbent).

As per claim 9: the digitised data is input to the digital processor as a standardised image compression signal and processed as JPEG files (column 4, lines 58-67).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the photofinishing system taught by Koike et al. with the disclosure of Wen in order to provide a high quality print rate with reduced image defects.

***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1 and 9 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

***Conclusion***

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to LAURA E. MARTIN whose telephone number is (571)272-2160. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, 7:00 - 3:30.

Art Unit: 2853

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen D. Meier can be reached on (571) 272-2149. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Laura E. Martin/  
Examiner, Art Unit 2853